

SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP 1501 K STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005 (202) 736 8000 (202) 736 8711 FAX BEIJING BRUSSELS CHICAGO DALLAS FRANKFURT GENEVA HONG KONG LONDON LOS ANGELES
NEW YORK
SAN FRANCISCO
SHANGHAI
SINGAPORE
SYDNEY
TOKYO
WASHINGTON, D.C.

jguerra@sidley.com (202) 736-8023

FOUNDED 1866

January 10, 2008

Ms. Deena Shetler
Deputy Division Chief, Pricing Policy Division
Wireline Competition Bureau
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: WC Docket No. 06-210

Dear Deena:

I am writing on behalf of AT&T Corp. in connection with the above-captioned proceeding, which was commenced in September 2006 pursuant to a referral to the Commission by the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey. The petitioners and their supporters¹ have repeatedly expressed a desire for a prompt disposition of this matter. AT&T shares that desire and believes the voluminous record establishes that AT&T should prevail on both the merits of the referred issue and its sanctions motion. Accordingly, AT&T does not intend to file additional comments in this proceeding unless the Commission requests further submissions on any of the issues raised.

Sincerely

Joseph R. Guerra

¹ None of those other persons and entities has any cognizable interest in this proceeding. For example, 800 Services recently requested sanctions against AT&T, but as AT&T explained in its January 5, 2007 submission, 800 Services sued AT&T unsuccessfully years ago, asserting various claims concerning AT&T's Tariff No. 2 service to 800 Services, including that AT&T improperly allocated shortfall charges to 800 Services' locations. In August 2000, the District Court dismissed 800 Services' claims and awarded AT&T a judgment of \$2.2 million (which remains unsatisfied), and the Third Circuit affirmed the District Court's judgment in all respects in February 2002.



Ms. Deena Shetler January 10, 2008 Page 2

cc:

Alphonse G. Inga Larry G. Shipp Phil Okin Joseph J. Kearney